

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,777	12/29/2004	Brian Robert Meyer	102792-385 (11053P1)	6949
27389	7590 11/17/2006		EXAMINER	
NORRIS, M 875 THIRD A	CLAUGHLIN & MAI	CAMPBELL, THOR S		
18TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK,	NY 10022		3742	<u> </u>

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06) Office Act	ion Summary	Part of Paper No./Mail D	ate 20061016
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date formal Patent Application 	
Attachment(s)			
			•
application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of		received.	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori		received in this National	Stage
2. Certified copies of the priority documents			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents		•	
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreigna) All b) Some * c) None of:	phonty under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
	oriority under 35 U.S.O. S	110(0) (4) 0- (5)	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the one of the correction of the correction including the correction including the correction of the correct			ED 1 101/4\
10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 December 2004 is/ar			niner.
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine			
Application Papers			
	election requirement.	•	
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>17 and 29</u> is/are objected to. 8)□ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement	·	
6) Claim(s) <u>1.2,6-16,18-28 and 30</u> is/are rejected.			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,6-23 and 26-30</u> is/are pending in t	he application.		
Disposition of Claims			
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.[D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar			e merits is
	action is non-final.		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 Ju	<i>ıly 2006</i> .		
Status			
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUN 36(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this RANDONED (35 U.S.C. \$ 133)	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL	V IS SET TO EVOIDE 2 M	AONTU(e) OD TUIDTY ((20) DAVO
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence a	nddress
	Thor S. Campbell	3742	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	NODEKT
-	10/519,777	MEYER, BRIAN	POPERT
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	

Application/Control Number: 10/519,777

Art Unit: 3742

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 6-12, 14-16, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsuda et al. (US 5644866) in view of Harwig et al. (US 6909840).

Katsuda discloses, *inter alia*, a heating device comprising a laminar of polymer resin film material having PTC characteristics applied to laminars of insulating material, a rechargeable battery and a wick having a heating means attached in proximity to the wick. Katsuda does not explicitly disclose the use of alternate heating means such as resistive ink and/or resistive wire. Harwig discloses a similar heating device and further teaches the use of any of three types of heating means, including film, resistive ink and resistive wire. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Katsuda with the teachings of Harwig to include either a resistive ink or a resistive wire heating means as it was known in the art to interchange these type of heating means.

Claims 9, 13, and 19-23, 26, 27, 28, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsuda et al. (US 5644866) in view of Harwig et al. (US 6909840).

Katsuda and Harwig teach the claimed invention, *inter alia*, a heating device comprising a laminar of polymer resin film material having PTC characteristics applied to laminars of insulating material, a rechargeable battery and a wick having a heating means attached in

Art Unit: 3742

proximity to the wick. Katsuda/Harwig does not explicitly disclose the specific design options as claimed by applicant in claims 9, 13, 19-23, 26-28, 30 however such design considerations and modifications are generally well known in the art and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make such modifications to the Katsuda device.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 17 and 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thor S. Campbell whose telephone number is 571-272-4776. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 5:30AM-2:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robin Evans can be reached on 571-272-4777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3742

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Thor S. Campbell Primary Examiner Art Unit 3742

TSC